

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the previous objections to the specification, and the previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 are all the claims pending in the present application. In summary, the Examiner maintains the same prior art rejections and adds a few new arguments in the *Response to Arguments* section of the present Office Action. Specifically claims 1 and 5 remain provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of pending Appln. No. 10/664,028, hereinafter referred to as App '028. Also, claims 1 and 5 remain provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 6, and 8 of pending Appln. No. 10/746,234, hereinafter referred to as App '234. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6¹ remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hinden et al. (RFC 2373 "IP Version 6 addressing Architecture"), hereinafter referred to as Hinden, in view of Itakura (U.S Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0060285). Finally, claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinden in view of Marttinen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,853).

Provisional Double Patenting Rejections (App '028) - Claims 1 and 5

First, Applicants maintain that claims 1 and 5 of the present application are patentably distinguishable over claims 1 and 4 of App '028 at least since claims 1 and 4 of App '028 do not recite, "providing an interface ID area comprising a company ID area and a serial number area

¹ The Examiner mistakenly indicates that claims 1-6 are rejected over the applied references. However, claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 are the only claims pending in the application.

using an EUI-64 ID format; and identifying the devices using device ID information for identifying types of the devices recorded in an unused area in the company ID area of an interface ID area, using an EUI-64 ID format, the unused area in the company ID area being an area excluding a used area used for representing the company ID in the company ID area, and using unique numbers assigned to devices recorded in the serial number area," as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Yet further, Applicants again request that the Examiner hold this rejection in abeyance until the other pending application issues as a patent. Specifically, according to MPEP § 804 I.B., if a provisional double patenting rejection in one application is the only rejection remaining, then the Examiner should withdraw the provisional rejection and permit that application to issue as a patent, thereby converting the provisional double patenting rejection in the other application, i.e., App '028, into a bona fide double patenting rejection at the time the one application issues as a patent. Therefore, if all other claim rejections are withdrawn in the present application, claims 1 and 5 should be found allowable and the present application should be permitted to issue as a patent.

Provisional Double Patenting Rejections (App '234) - Claims 1 and 5

Applicant requests that the Examiner hold this rejection in abeyance at least based on reasons similar to those set forth in the paragraph above.

§103(a) Rejections (Hinden / Itakura) - Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 are rejected over Hinden and Itakura based on the reasons set forth on pages 4-6 of the Office Action.

Applicants previously argued that neither Hinden nor Itakura, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests at least, "providing an interface ID area comprising a

company ID area and a serial number area using an EUI-64 ID format; and identifying the devices using device ID information for identifying types of the devices recorded in an unused area in the company ID area and using unique numbers assigned to devices recorded in the serial number area, wherein the unused area in the company ID area is an area excluding a used area used for representing manufacturers of the devices in the company ID area," as recited in amended claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 5.

In response, the Examiner simply alleges:

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR § 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

In response, first, Applicants point out that the specific features of previously amended claims 1 and 5 that Applicant submits are not taught or suggested by the applied references were previously identified.

Further, in the present Office Action, the Examiner has not addressed each and every feature of the claimed invention, as set forth in the previous Amendment. For example, the Examiner does not address how the applied references, either alone or in combination, allegedly disclose or suggest at least, "providing an interface ID area comprising a company ID area and a serial number area using an EUI-64 ID format," as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 5.

Therefore, at least based on the foregoing as well as the previously presented argument, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 5 are patentably distinguishable over the applied references, either alone or in combination.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 3 and 6 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 5.

§103(a) Rejections (Hinden / Marttinen) - Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6


Similar to above, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not addressed each and every feature of the claimed invention, as set forth in the previous Amendment, with respect to the claim rejections over Hinden and Marttinen.

Further, Applicants submit the following in support of patentability of the claimed invention.

Device ID information of exemplary embodiments of the claimed invention can be arranged in unused area (C) among the company ID area (B). However, the part which the Examiner alleges corresponds to the claimed device ID information is the manufacturer selected extension identifier (A). As seen from the Figure herein below, (C) is absolutely different from extension identifier (A). Applicants do not understand why the Examiner thinks that (C) is the same as (A).

The claimed invention can use a part of a company ID area (B), i.e., the unused area in the company ID area (B) to represent device ID information, but the applied art does not disclose using the unused area among the company ID area (B) to represent device ID information.

Figure:



In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 11, 2008

Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778